What pulls ancestral tourists 'home'? An analysis of ancestral tourist motivations.

Dr S. Murdy
Dr M. Alexander
Dr D. Bryce

Abstract

Ancestry has received limited attention within the tourism literature but is shown to play a crucial role in heritage tourism, especially for countries with extended diasporas such as Ireland, Italy India, China, and Scotland. The purpose of this study is to explore ancestral tourist motivations, and attain a broader understanding of this market. A survey of 282 ancestral tourists allowed the identification of three key factors: ancestral tourist motivation; heritage tourist motivations; and mass tourist motivation. These themes enabled a detailed analysis of clusters, identifying four ancestral segments: full heritage immersion; the ancestral enthusiast; general interest; and heritage focused. Given the lack of funding and resources currently available to ancestral tourism providers, the identification of these factors goes some way to highlighting productive areas of focus for promotional efforts and resources.

Keywords: ancestral tourism; motivations; cluster analysis; exploratory factor analysis

1.   Introduction

The phenomenon of research into one's personal and collective ancestry has been considered within the literature since the late 1970s (Smith, 1979). However, the recent proliferation of television shows and websites facilitating ancestral research has enhanced the popularity of this pastime. The result is an enhanced interest within diasporic markets in travelling to locations from which their forebears emigrated to explore family histories alongside a sense of collective belonging. Thus, people seek to revisit history in the form of their own personal narrative (Meethan, 2004), which can result in the need to keep links with (Iorio & Corsale, 2012), or explore, a 'homeland' which can be perceived quite differently from reality (Sim & Leith, 2012). We define ancestral tourism as "any visit which might be partly or wholly motivated by a need to connect or reconnect with an individual's ancestral past" (Reference withheld). Previously, this activity has been referred to in general terms (e.g. roots, diaspora, homesick, or legacy tourism; see Basu, 2004; 2005; Iorio & Corsale, 2012; Marschall, 2015), or the need to establish factual evidence (e.g. genealogical or family history tourism; see Santos & Yan, 2010; Savolainen, 1995; Yakel, 2004). We will use the term 'ancestral tourism' as it is sufficiently capacious to accommodate each of these forms of reference, and is the phrase most commonly used within the country explored within the context of this study (VisitScotland, 2017a;b).

It has previously been suggested that the exploration of one's ancestry is not only a growing area, but one of special interest, in which the travel motivation of ancestral tourists differs from that of other heritage tourists (Poria, Butler, & Airey, 2003; reference withheld). However, many heritage sites do not take this fully into account often for reasons of limited necessary resources. By failing to address these specific motivations sites may not benefit fully from this important emerging market segment. It is proposed that the provision of facilities and services to anticipate and accommodate ancestral tourists' desire for personal meaning-making and a fuller understanding of their motivations by heritage sites, may have positive implications for both the marketing and success of many destinations (Timothy, 1997; reference withheld).

Recent studies suggest a spectrum of motivations that can underpin ancestral visits (Marschall, 2015; Li & McKercher, 2016). However, empirical quantitative data which considers the added value ancestral tourism can provide to a destination is scant. Timothy

(1997) proposed that local tourism business and communities could benefit from further research into personal heritage, and ancestral tourism. For example, where destinations have a focus on key attractions relative to the ancestral context (e.g. cemeteries, genealogical centres, historic churches, buildings, and memorials), the use of these sites both assist in the contribution to the ancestral tourist experience, and enhance the identity of the destination for residents. Thus, it is essential to understand and anticipate specific attributes that drive ancestral tourists to particular destinations at national, regional and local levels, respond to them and thereby enhance their overall experience. As such, the purpose of this study is to explore these dimensions of ancestral tourist motivations.

1.1 Heritage tourist motivations

Dann's (1977) push-pull framework has been used to examine travel behaviours across a variety of pull and push contexts, for example, national parks (Kim, Lee, & Klenosky, 2003), or the motivations of visitors from the United Arab Emirates (Prayag & Hosany, 2014). Push factors have been identified to consist of psychological forces, for example, desire for escape, adventure, self-exploration, or social interaction (Chen & Chen, 2015). Contrastingly, pull factors consist of features of a destination that attract visitors, for example, nature, and sports facilities (Dann, 1977; Klenosky, 2002; Chen & Chen, 2015).

Varying motivations have been identified within the realm of heritage (Apostolakis, 2003; Ashworth, 1996; Poria, Reichel, & Biran, 2006). Such examples include, but are not limited to, the presence of attractive settings, architectural merit, atmosphere, an enjoyable day out (Shackley, 2001), personal benefit, or knowledge (Chen, 1998). However, others suggest differing motives could be influenced through various locations of data collection or the timing of the collection, resulting in a lack of attention to those who have not yet been to the site (Poria et al., 2006; Davies & Prentice, 1995). Given the broad notion of heritage as something that can be linked to, for example, eco-tourism (Ivanko, 1996), dark tourism (White & Frew, 2013), or adventure tourism (McCain & Ray. 2003), the identification of varying motivations should come as no surprise.

1.2 Ancestral tourist motivations

Although the importance of exploring niche segments in heritage tourism has been considered, the legacy, or personal heritage market has been somewhat overlooked (McCain & Ray, 2003). Individuals interact with heritage places based on their own cultural

background (Ashworth, 1996; Poria, et al., 2006), and these interactions have been shown to go beyond merely educational purposes and invoke emotional experiences, and connections to one's ancestors (Poria et al., 2003; McCain & Ray, 2003). As such, Poria, Butler, and Airey (2003) argue those whom seek a personal element on their heritage journey are likely to act significantly differently to others interested in heritage.

The principal motivation for ancestral tourists is the desire to explore family history, and to better understand their 'home' identity (Bhandari, 2013). However, research has identified a number of other motivations within more general notions of heritage that may link specifically into the ancestral context, such as historic sites and landscapes which indicate a more general sense of belonging (McCain & Ray, 2003; Marschall, 2015). These push-pull motivations have been discussed broadly using legacy tourism as a basis (McCain & Ray, 2003; Ray & McCain, 2012), from a conceptual notion of self-identity (Higginbotham, 2012), a qualitative exploration (Santos & Yan, 2010; Li & McKercher, 2016), or as one overarching ancestral motivation (Smith, 1979).

1.2   Ancestral tourism in Scotland

Populations have migrated throughout the world since before the emergence of recorded history and for various reasons. Significant examples in the modern era (i.e. from c.17th century onwards) include those from Ireland, Italy, India, China and Scotland. Large levels of Scottish emigration have occurred within phased periods over the last 250 years (Devine, 2011). Much of this emigration resulted in travel to four main English speaking territories, which became the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand (Cameron, 2002). Difficulties exist in identifying specific figures for emigration over this period, yet it is estimated that between 20 and 90 million people are linked to the Scottish Diaspora within these countries (VisitScotland, 2013). Research has shown evidence of Scotland's heritage and ancestral focus in marketing communications since the mid-1990s (see Pritchard & Morgan, 1996). Ancestral tourism has now received further attention from the Scottish tourism industry given claims that this particular sector attracts 213,000 visitors to Scotland each year, with a further 4.3 million tourists within this market whom could be persuaded to visit during a five year period. Visit Scotland estimates that this increase in visitation could be worth an additional £2.4 billion to the Scottish tourism industry as whole, making it a key strategic focus (VisitScotland, 2013).

2.   Methodology

The purpose of this study was to explore and test a scale of ancestral tourist motivations. Literature was examined to seek existing scales and attributes were identified for inclusion relative to the ancestral context (see McCain & Ray, 2003; Ray & McCain, 2012; Santos & Yan, 2010; Smith, 1979). Given the complexity of ancestral tourism interactions and difficulties seeking ancestral tourists, the initial phase explored perspectives related to the ancestral tourism experience from the supply side. A total of 32 interviews were conducted with museum curators, archivists, and volunteers across 29 sites throughout Scotland providing services useful to ancestral tourists' research (reference withheld). The initial qualitative study ensured elements of importance for ancestral tourism 'suppliers' were included in the study with ancestral tourist motivations identified in the literature (Bhandari, 2013; Marschall, 2015). Furthermore, literature exploring ancestral tourist motivations has commonly used a qualitative approach. As such, findings from the interviews, in combination with attributes from the literature and a review of VisitScotland's website, were used to develop a survey to explore ancestral tourist motivation quantitatively (see Table 1). A total of 14 motivations were identified for exploration.

Table 1. Questionnaire design.

Attribute	Literature	Interviews	Visit Scotland, Ancestral	Visit Scotland, Things to see and do
Know where they lived	x	x	x	
Connected to my ancestors	x	x		
Scottish country/ wildlife	x			x
Culture and heritage	x	x		
How they lived	x	x	x	
Explore Scottish history	x	x	x	
Obtain documentary evidence	x	x	x	
Scottish identity	x	x	x	
Tourist attractions				x
Local food				x
Family tree	x	x	x	
Scottish entertainment				x
Shop for Scottish products				x
Whisky				x

Sources: Basu, 2010; Bhandari, 2013; Marschall, 2015; McCain & Ray, 2003; Palmer, 2005; Ray & McCain, 2009; Ray & McCain, 2012; Santos & Yan, 2010; Smith, 1979; VisitScotland, 2017a; VisitScotland, 2017b.

The survey was tested with five ancestral tourists, before being sent to sites across Scotland for data collection (see Appendix 1). Data was collected from May of 2014 to September of 2015 in two allocated periods – May through September each year. These months were

chosen as many of the sites were only open during these months, and they were peak seasons for ancestral tourists (as identified from the initial interviews). Twenty sites across both years were involved in the study and returned surveys. Staff from all sites had participated in the initial qualitative phase, so were aware of the purpose of the research. As such, it was possible for the researchers to discuss data collection protocols in advance, and all sites were provided with an instruction sheet to ensure that data collection was consistent. Questionnaires were located at information desks, and visitors were also directed to fill these in if they had specific ancestral queries.

3.　　Results

A total of 318 responses were returned from 20 sites. However, some of these were not suitable for analysis and were removed for one of two reasons: 1) multiple people completing the same survey, or more than 15% missing data (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010). As such, 282 usable responses were retained for analysis. Sample characteristics are outlined in Table 2.

The most predominant age of ancestral tourists was found to between 50 and 69 (71.2%), followed by those 70 and older (14.8%). The majority of tourists were from three of the four identified territories of significant emigration: USA, Australia, and Canada (71.2%), followed by those domestic tourists interested in their ancestral past (Scotland and England; 18.9%). Travelling either as a couple (45.6%) or as a family (27.9%) were the most common choices when considering companions. Finally, serviced accommodation (e.g. bed and breakfast, and hotels; 65.4%) was the most sought after type of accommodation for ancestral tourists.

Table 2. Sample characteristics.

	Variable	N	Valid %
Gender	Female	106	54.1
	Male	90	45.9
	Total	**196**	**100.0**
	Missing	86	
Age	16-29	11	4.0
	30-49	28	10.1
	50-69	197	71.2
	70+	41	14.8
	Total	**277**	**100.0**
	Missing	5	-
Country of residence	USA	89	31.7
	Australia	62	22.1
	Canada	49	17.4
	England	37	13.2
	Scotland	16	5.7
	New Zealand	14	5.0
	Wales	2	0.7
	Republic of Ireland	2	0.7
	Other	10	3.6
	Total	**281**	**100.0**
	Missing	1	-
Companions	Couple	124	45.6
	Family	76	27.9
	Alone	54	19.9
	Friends	12	4.4
	Tour group	6	2.2
	Total	**272**	**100.0**
	Missing	10	-
Accommodation	Bed and breakfast	89	36.6
	Hotel	70	28.8
	Self-catering	43	17.7
	Backpacker hostel	9	3.2
	Camping	9	3.2
	Staying with family	8	2.8
	Other	15	6.2
	Total	**243**	**100.0**
	Missing	39	-

Descriptives were reviewed to explore the normality and skewness of the data. Table 3 outlines the mean, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis for each of the attributes. All scale means but one (whisky) were above the scale mid-point of 4. Field (2005) suggests when considering skewness and kurtosis that normality can be seen with a threshold up to 3.29, meaning that all data was normally distributed.

Table 3. Descriptives.

Attribute	N	Mean	S.D	Skewness	Kurtosis
Know where they lived	277	6.01	1.41	-1.74	2.58
Connected to my ancestors	275	5.91	1.36	-1.22	1.08
Scottish country/ wildlife	273	5.73	1.41	-1.26	1.42
Culture and heritage	271	5.72	1.24	-1.00	1.25
How they lived	278	5.71	1.40	-1.01	.51
Explore Scottish history	274	5.64	1.32	-.82	.39
Obtain documentary evidence	274	5.64	1.70	-1.07	.06
Scottish identity	274	5.51	1.48	-.97	.47
Tourist attractions	271	5.37	1.45	-.71	-.13
Local food	274	5.19	1.62	-.67	-.29
Family tree	275	5.19	1.87	-.79	-.45
Scottish entertainment	272	4.42	1.69	-.18	-.82
Shop for Scottish products	275	4.34	1.40	-.15	-.86
Whisky	272	3.78	2.23	.17	-1.38

In order to explore constructs of ancestral tourism motivations, an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted. The data was analysed using principal axis factoring with a promax rotation in SPSS 22.0. Three factors emerged from the factor analysis with one cross-loading attribute (explore Scottish identity). As such, this attribute was removed, and three separate factors were identified (see Table 4). Examination of the KMO, eigenvalues and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (KMO=.79; Variance explained=67.16%; p=.000) suggested that the derived factor structure was a good fit to the data (Bryman & Cramer, 2009; Coakes, Steed, & Ong, 2010; Tabacknick & Fidell, 2007). The reliability of each factor was assessed using the Cronbach's (1951) alpha. All factors were found to have Cronbach's alphas above the .70 cut-off.

Table 4. Exploratory Factor Analysis

	Factors		
Attributes	Ancestral tourism motivation	Mass tourism motivation	Heritage tourism motivation
Family tree	.871		
Obtain documentary evidence	.820		
Know where they lived	.707		
How they lived	.699		
Entertainment		.742	
Shop for Scottish products		.710	
Whisky		.607	
Tourist attractions		.575	
Local food		.527	
Scottish country/wildlife			.769
Culture and heritage			.748
Explore Scottish history			.721
Scottish identity			.430
α	.87	.78	.78

A *K*-means clustering procedure was conducted to classify ancestral tourists into segments. Clusters were assessed based on the constructs identified in the EFA: ancestral tourism motivation; mass tourism motivation; and heritage tourism motivation. It was determined by plotting the coefficients of the sum of squared error and examining the elbow of the graph that a four cluster solution was most appropriate. The ANOVA results indicated the contribution of the factors to the differentiation of the clusters (Lee, Lee, Bernhard, & Yoon, 2006). Scheffe multiple range tests were undertaken to evaluate any differences between the clusters, and significant differences were found across all cluster pairs, except one (see table 5).

Table 5. Summary statistics of cluster analysis of ancestral tourist motivations.

	Clusters				F-Value	Scheffe multiple range tests					
	I	II	III	IV		I-II	I-III	I-IV	II-III	II-IV	III-IV
	n=101	n=80	n=40	n=55							
Ancestral	6.60	6.21	3.55	4.74	239.88	***	***	***	***	***	***
Mass tourism	5.60	3.40	4.09	4.98	101.53	***	***	***	***	***	***
Heritage	6.44	5.18	4.35	6.07	77.87	***	***	.07[a]	***	***	***
Cluster name	*Full heritage immersion*	*Ancestral enthusiast*	*General interest*	*Heritage focus*							

Note. ***<.05; [a] not significant.

Cluster differences were further considered through a chi-square analysis, using characteristics identified within the survey (see table 6). Given the exploratory nature of the survey, and the multiple options available, some of the variables were split across too many categories to enable statistical analysis. If more than 20% of the cells had a count less than five the statistical results were not considered any further (Yates, Moore, & McCabe. 1999).

Table 6. Cluster differences by ancestral tourists' characteristics

Characteristics	Cluster I (n=101)	Cluster II (n=80)	Cluster III (n=40)	Cluster IV (n=55)
Primary purpose*				
Ancestral	52	32	30	42
Not ancestral	42	41	5	5
Gender [a]				
Male	29	26	15	20
Female	39	26	15	22
Age[b]				
16-29	3	0	4	4
30-49	10	6	3	8
50-69	69	59	28	37
70+	15	14	5	6
Country of residence[b]				
USA	37	17	15	20
Australia	18	29	6	6
Canada	18	11	8	11
England	11	10	6	9
Scotland	8	4	1	3
New Zealand	6	5	1	2
Wales	1	1	0	0
Republic of Ireland	0	1	1	0
Other	2	2	2	4
Travelling companions [b]				
Couple	44	31	19	29
Family	33	20	10	12
Alone	19	18	7	7
Friends	1	6	1	3
Tour group	1	1	2	2
Accommodation[b]				
Bed and breakfast	35	29	8	16
Hotel	22	15	16	14
Self-catering	17	11	8	6
Backpacker hostel	0	4	1	4
Camping	6	1	1	1
Staying with family	1	4	0	3
Other	5	3	4	3
Planning to come back*				
Yes	90	68	20	41
No	9	7	17	9
Pre-research[b]				
None	0	0	3	1
Talked to family/ knowledge	10	6	11	14
Limited internet search	8	2	2	8
Some research on family tree	30	24	9	12
Extensive genealogical research	30	32	1	12

Adequately resourced[a]				
Yes	81	51	21	37
No	14	17	4	7
Keep in contact[*]				
Yes	84	56	15	23
No	13	11	21	26
First visit to Scotland[a]				
Yes	36	22	19	25
No	62	57	21	30

Note. [*]significant; [a] not significant; [b] low cell counts

Gender did not significantly differ across the clusters (X^2(3, N=192) = .82, *p*=.85). Participants were asked whether or not ancestral activities were the main purpose of their trip, and significant differences were found across the clusters (X^2(3, N=249) = 35.49, *p*<.01). Interestingly, the *general interest* and *heritage focus* clusters were proportionately more likely to state ancestral reasons as the main purpose of their trip, yet the ancestral mean is ultimately lower for these two clusters versus the other two. <mark>Given the wording of our travel purpose question (see Appendix 1), it could be suggested this result is influenced by those travel companions who do not necessarily have direct ancestral links, yet the purpose of the trip for the overall group was ancestral.</mark> Whether or not they would be returning to Scotland also differed across clusters (X^2(3, N=261) = 30.58, *p*<.01). Proportionately, the *general interest* cluster was less likely to state they would return to Scotland. This is in line with the means identified for this cluster, which were somewhat lower than all other clusters for each construct, suggesting they do not have a specific 'Scottish desire' or were accompanying someone with much more of an ancestral interest. Finally, whether or not they would remain in contact with the organisation regarding their ancestral journey was found to differ across clusters (X^2(3, N=249) = 45.87, *p*<.01). Both *ancestral enthusiast* and *full heritage immersion* clusters were identified to be highly likely to contact these organisations again for further information, or with ancestral updates.

4.   Conclusion

Ancestral tourism has become increasingly important to the Scottish tourism industry. Yet, the provision of service delivery falls on many small museums, archives and heritage centres throughout Scotland as tourists seek ways to explore their ancestral roots. Given the lack of understanding of ancestral tourist motivations, it is essential to consider what pulls ancestral tourists 'home'. This research suggests that a combination of three factors, one of these relating specifically to ancestral services to explore Scottish identity (in line with Bhandari,

2013), can influence the desire for those who wish to trace their personal heritage. While still in an exploratory phase, the findings from this study go some way to understanding where service providers can focus their resources to better address ancestral tourists' wants, and encourage both positive word-of-mouth and repeat visitation.

The identification of four ancestral tourist segments provides insight into the market for organisations which provide such services. Examination of the four clusters outlines a continuum of ancestral motivation. Those whom have a very high mean of ancestral tourism motivation (*mean* = 6.60) in cluster I were also highly motivated to explore heritage tourism in general (*mean* = 6.44) and elements of the mass tourism market (*mean* = 5.60). These tourists wanted *full heritage immersion* the Scottish tourism industry had to offer. The second cluster, while still high on ancestral tourism motivations (*mean* = 6.21) and general heritage (*mean* = 5.18), was much lower when considering mass tourism components (*mean* = 3.40), thus their focus was broadly that of heritage with a personal element. These first two segments addressed 65.58% of all ancestral tourists who participated in the survey. The third cluster was much lower across all variables (*mean* = 4.35 or lower), while the fourth cluster had a high interest in general heritage (*mean* = 6.07), but was lower in relation to mass tourism elements (*mean* = 4.98) or ancestral elements (*mean* = 4.74). Given the identification of these clusters, it is important for organisations promoting ancestral tourism to understand that while tourists will have differing levels of ancestral tourist motivation, two other factors play varying roles across all segments. The promotion of general heritage as well as mass tourism elements, provides an overall experience sought by a number of ancestral tourists. Ancestral tourism was identified as a primary reason for travel by many, but without the other elements there is a risk of under providing the ancestral experience to the market.

Future research is recommended within the ancestral context. While the dispersed and often remote localities visited by ancestral tourists make it difficult to capture their views in a lengthy qualitative study, such would assist in exploring these motivations in greater depth. Scotland is just one destination that people from many countries can, and want to, trace their ancestors to; other examples might include Italy, Ireland, India, and China. As such, the consideration of further countries which benefit from ancestral tourism (Kramer, 2011) would allow comparisons to be made, and a universal ancestral motivation scale to be developed. In addition, the researchers aim to explore the experiences of ancestral tourists within their

countries of residence, which specifically for this study, have been identified as: Australia, England, Canada, and the United States of America.

In conclusion, this scale will be of benefit to the Scottish tourism industry given the push to promote ancestry as a core feature and experience of the tourism product. Initially it suggests that factors of importance can be identified to develop the way ancestral tourism is promoted to prospective markets, and to ensure that the delivery of ancestral tourism can be enhanced throughout the country. The nature of ancestral tourism requires a personal journey, and results in much of the market travelling to sites that may appear in the peripheral of wider Scottish tourism offerings (reference withheld). The identification of three key motivations factors and four key segments of ancestral tourists can provide a focus for many of these peripheral museums, archives, and heritage centres which attract this market. Many of these peripheral organisations operate with limited budgets and staffing (references withheld), thus requiring further understanding to meet the needs of this market more effectively and efficiently. While many of these organisations may outline the potential exploration of one's family history, a better understanding of the aspects which make up the ancestral journey (e.g. obtaining documents; seeing how their ancestors lived), can allow them to better educate ancestral tourists about the resources available to them, thus improving and emphasising the 'ancestral experience'. By enhancing the understanding of these tourists, and segments, it enables these attractions to better focus on ancestral motives, and encourage both a positive 'ancestral experience' and repeat tourist experiences.

References

Apostolakis, A. (2003). The convergence process in heritage tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 30*(4), 795-812.

Ashworth, G. (1996). Struggling to control the past. *InFocus, 22*(1996), 4-5. In Poria, Y., Reichel, A., & Biran, A. (2006). Heritage site perceptions and motivations to visit. *Journal of Travel Research, 44*(3), 318-326.

Basu, P. (2004). My Own Island Home: The Orkney Homecoming. *Journal of Material Culture, 9*(1), 27-42.

Basu, P. (2005). Roots tourism as return movement: semantics and the Scottish diaspora. In M. Harper (Ed.), *Emigrant homecomings: the return movement of emigrants 1600-2000* (pp. 131-150). Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Bhandari, K. (2013). Imagining the Scottish nation: tourism and homeland nationalism in Scotland. *Current Issues in Tourism, 19*(9), 913-929.

Bryman, A., & Cramer, D. (2009). *Quantitative data analysis with SPSS 14, 15 & 16: A guide for social* scientists. New York: Routledge.

Cameron, E. (2002). "The Scottish Highlands." *In Scotland in the 20th Century*, edited by T.M. Devine and R Finlay. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Chen, J.S. (1998). Travel motivation of heritage tourists. *Tourism Analysis, 2*(3-4), 213-215.

Chen, L-J., & Chen, W-P. (2015). Push-pull factors in international birders' travel. *Tourism Management, 48*(2015), 416-425.

Coakes, S.J., Steed, L., & Ong, C. (2010). *SPSS version 17.0 for windows: Analysis without anguish*. Milton, Qld: John Wiley & Sons Australia.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16*, 297-333.

Dann, G. (1977). Anomie, ego-enhancement and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 4*(4) 184-194.

Davies, A., & Prentice, R. (1995). Conceptualizing the latent visitor to heritage attractions. *Tourism Management, 16*(7), 491-500.

Devine, T. M. (2011). *To the Ends of the Earth: Scotland's Global Diaspora, 1750-2010*. London: Penguin UK.

Field, A. (2005). Discovering statistics using SPSS (2nd ed). London: Sage Publications.

Hair, J. F, Jr., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis: A global perspective* (7th Ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.

Higginbotham, G. (2012). Seeking roots and tracing lineages: constructing a framework of reference for roots and genealogical tourism. *Journal of Heritage Tourism, 7*(3), 189-203. doi: 10.1080/1743873X.2012.669765

Iorio, M., & Corsale, A. (2012). Diaspora and Tourism: Trnasylvanian Saxons visiting the Homeland. *Tourism Geographies, 15*(2), 198-232.

Ivanko, J.D. (1996). Western society and ecotourism: Travelling companions? *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society, 16*(1-2), 28-34.

Kim, S.S., Lee, C.K., & Klenosky, D.B. (2003). The influence of push and pull factors at Korean national parks. *Tourism Management, 24*(2), 169-180.

Klenosky, D. B. (2002). The pull of tourism destinations: a means-end investigation. *Journal of travel research, 40*(4), 385-395.

Kramer, A.M. (2011). Mediatizing memory: History, affect and identity in Who Do You Think You Are. *European Journal of Cultural Studies, 14(4),* 428-445.

Lee, C-K., Lee, Y-K., Bernhard, J., & Yoon, Y-S. (2006). Segmenting casino gamblers by motivation: A cluster analysis of Korean gamblers. *Tourism Management, 27*(5), 856-866.

Li, T. E., & McKercher, B. (2016). Developing a typology of diaspora tourists: Return travel by Chinese immigrants in North America. *Tourism Management*, 56, 106-113.

Marschall, S. (2015). "'Homesick Tourism': Memory, Identity and (Be)longing." *Current Issues in Tourism, 18(9)*, 876–92.

McCain, G., & Ray, N.M. (2003). Legacy tourism: the search for personal meaning in heritage travel. *Tourism Management, 24*(6), 713-717.

Meethan, K. (2004). To stand in the shoes of my ancestors: Tourism and genealogy. In T. Coles and D.J. Timothy (Eds). *Tourism, diasporas and space* (pp. 139-150). London: Routledge.

Palmer, C. (2005). An ethnography of Englishness: Experiencing identity through tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 32*(1), 7-27.

Poria, Y., Butler, R., & Airey, D. (2003). The core of heritage tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 30*(1), 238-254.

Poria, Y., Reichel, A., & Biran, A. (2006). Heritage site perceptions and motivations to visit. *Journal of Travel Research, 44*(3), 318-326.

Prayag, G., & Hosany, S. (2014). When Middle East meets West: understanding the motives and perceptions of young tourists from United Arab Emirates. *Tourism Management, 40*(2014), 35-45.

Pritchard, A., & Morgan, N.J. (1996). Selling the Celtic Arc to the USA: a comparative analysis of the destination brochure images used in the marketing of Ireland, Scotland and Wales. *Journal of Vacation Marketing, 2*(4), 346-365.

Ray, N.M., & McCain, G. (2012). Personal identity and nostalgia for the distant land of past: Legacy tourism. *International Business & Economics Research Journal, 11*(9), 977-990.

Santos, C.A., & Yan, G. (2010). Genealogical Tourism: A phenomenological examination. *Journal of Travel Research, 49*(1), 56-67.

Savolainen, R. (1995). Everyday life information seeking: Approaching information seeking in the context of "way of life". *Library & Information Science Research, 17*(3), 259-294.

Shackley, M. (2001). *Managing sacred sites: service provision and visitor experience.* London: Thomson Learning.

Sim, D., & Leith, M. (2012). Diaspora tourists and the Scottish Homecoming 2009. *Journal of Heritage Tourism, 8*(4), 259-274.

Smith, V.L. (1979). Women: The taste-makers in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 6*(1), 49-60.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L .S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed). Boston: Pearson Education.

Timothy, D. (1997). Tourism and the personal heritage experience. *Annals of Tourism Research, 24(3),* 751-54.

VisitScotland. (2013). "*Summary of Ancestral Research 2012*". Retrieved from http://www.visitscotland.org/pdf/Ancestral%20Research%2016%20Jan%20vs.org_pppp.pdf (accessed May 10, 2015)

VisitScotland. (2017a). *"Things to see & do"*. Retrieved from https://www.visitscotland.com/see-do/ (accessed 20 February, 2017).

VisitScotland. (2017b). *"Ancestry"*. Retrieved from https://www.visitscotland.com/see-do/research-your-ancestry/ (accessed 20 February, 2017).

White, L., & Frew, E. (2013). *Dark tourism and place identity: managing and interpreting dark places.* Abingdon: New York Routledge.

Yakel, E. (2004). Seeking information, seeking connections, seeking meaning: Genealogists and family historians. *Information Research, 10*(1).

Yates, D., Moore, D., & McCabe, G. (1999). The Practice of Statistics (1st Ed.). New York: W.H. Freeman.

Appendix 1. Ancestral tourist survey.

With respect to my holiday in Scotland, I want to...	Strongly disagree (1)						Strongly agree (7)
Explore Scottish history.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Feel connected to my ancestors.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Explore Scottish countryside/ wildlife.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Feel connected to a Scottish identity	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Know where my family lived.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Try local food.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Explore Scottish culture and heritage.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Find out how my family lived their lives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Shop for Scottish products.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Try Scottish whisky.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Obtain documentary evidence of my family.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Visit Scottish tourist attractions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Complete my family tree.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Explore Scottish entertainment.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Country of residence
- ❐ Scotland
- ❐ England
- ❐ Wales
- ❐ Northern Ireland
- ❐ Republic of Ireland
- ❐ Canada
- ❐ United States of America
- ❐ Australia
- ❐ New Zealand
- ❐ Other (please state)
  _____

Travel companions *(select ONE option)*
- ❐ Alone
- ❐ Couple
- ❐ Family
- ❐ Tour group
- ❐ Business associates
- ❐ Friends

What accommodation have you most commonly used? *(select ONE option)*
- ❐ Hotel
- ❐ Self-catering
- ❐ Staying with family
- ❐ Backpacker hostel
- ❐ Camping
- ❐ Bed and Breakfast
- ❐ Other _____

Gender
- ❐ Male
- ❐ Female

Age
- ❐ 16-19
- ❐ 20-29
- ❐ 30-39
- ❐ 40-49
- ❐ 50-59
- ❐ 60-69
- ❐ 70-79
- ❐ 80+

How much research did you do before your trip? *(select ONE option which best applies to you)*
- ❐ None
- ❐ Talked to family/ knowledge of family history
- ❐ Limited search on internet
- ❐ Have conducted some research on family tree
- ❐ Extensive genealogical background research

Which best describes your trip?	❒ Family history is not the main focus but we will undertake research while in Scotland ❒ Family history is the main reason for our trip to Scotland

Is this your first visit to Scotland?	❒ Yes		❒ No	
If **no**, how many times have you visited before?	_____			
If **no**, is this your first visit to explore your family history?	❒ Yes		❒ No	
Would you consider coming back to explore your family history?	❒ Yes		❒ No	
Are you planning to keep in contact with people who have assisted you (e.g. genealogists, volunteers, museum curators, archivists)?	❒ Yes		❒ No	
Do you believe the places you have visited for your family history have been adequately resourced?	❒ Yes		❒ No	